

Title	<Teil I Zum Gedenken an Professor Norio Fujisawa> Prof. Fujisawa and his Essay 'Change of Situation and Change of Thing'
Author(s)	TAKAHASHI, Norio
Citation	Interdisziplinäre Phänomenologie = Interdisciplinary Phenomenology (2005), 2: 5-7
Issue Date	2005
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2433/188126">http://hdl.handle.net/2433/188126</a>
Right	© 2005, Lehrstuhl für "Philosophy of Human and Environmental Symbiosis" an der "Graduate School of Global Environmental Studies", Kyoto University published by the Chair of Philosophy of Human and Environmental Symbiosis, Kyoto University
Type	Departmental Bulletin Paper
Textversion	publisher

## **Prof. Fujisawa and his Essay 'Change of Situation and Change of Thing'**

Norio TAKAHASHI

Prof. Fujisawa has rarely criticized his master, Tanaka Michitaro. Only one exceptional case is found in a note in his essay 'Change of Situation and Change of Thing: Philosophical Significance of the Puzzles Concerning Size and Number in Plato's *Theaetetus*'. The note is concerned with the problem of how to translate a phrase (*eme telikonde onta*) in a passage which states the puzzle. Prof. Fujisawa raises an objection to Prof. Tanaka's translation 'I, being of this age', and insists that this phrase should be translated as 'I, being of this size'.

When so stated, the problem may seem very trivial. The argument about this note, however, develops into a bigger problem of how to understand the essence of Plato's philosophy as a whole. It is no exaggeration to say that the note seems to make us realize one big advance in the development of the study of Plato's philosophy in Japan. I will explain this later. Now I would like to divulge a memory about this note.

This essay was printed in *The Journal of Philosophical Studies* published by The Kyoto Philosophical Society in 1984. Prof. Fujisawa entrusted me with the task of reading the proofs before its publication. They were perhaps the first proofs. In this first stage of proofreading an addition was made to the note by Prof. Fujisawa. The amount of the addition written in red ink was not little, and it turned out to be a somewhat severe criticism to Prof. Tanaka. But the addition had been inserted in a wholly inappropriate place. I moved it into the right place, and told this to Prof. Fujisawa. He looked a bit strange but said nothing to me. I could not read his face, but simply thought that the hesitation to criticize his master had made him commit the error.

Now that I have understood his achievements in philosophy a little deeper, various things concerning the note occur to me.

The reasons why Prof. Fujisawa insists that *eme telikonde onta* should be translated as 'I, being of this size' are concerned with the problem of how to understand the philosophical significance of the puzzle in relation to the *Theaetetus* as a whole. At first old Socrates was taller than the youthful Theaetetus, but in a year Theaetetus becomes taller. Because Socrates does not lose anything from his stature, he does not change in his height (does not become smaller). But from a different perspective, because he is exceeded in height by Theaetetus, he changes (becomes smaller). In the usual interpretation this is no real problem at all. In the interpretation of Prof. Fujisawa, however, this puzzle forces us to choose which is the genuine change (for example, change of height), i.e. whether it is the change by addition to and/or

taking away from the original height, or the change in changed relationships. Contrary to common sense and various interpretations, Prof. Fujisawa insists that Socrates (Plato) takes the change in changed relationships to be genuine and rejects the view that the change by addition and/or taking away is genuine, together with the underlying supposition that a thing has in itself a certain property (e.g. height or bulk).

The passages which introduce the puzzle start with the sentence the point of which is the following: if a thing had a certain property in itself, when it encounters another thing, it would not change, so long as it is not affected in itself. This sentence takes the form of the unreal conditional. So it should be denied that a thing has a certain property in itself, and it should be also denied that the thing itself does not change in changed relationships. Prof. Fujisawa points out rightly that the phrase '*eme telikonde onta*' in the puzzle corresponds to the protasis of the unreal conditional (if a thing had a certain property in itself), and that the phrase should be translated as 'I, being of this size'. He criticizes Prof. Tanaka for focusing on only incidental contexts just before and after this phrase.

Prof. Fujisawa connects the understanding of this puzzle to Socrates' famous wandering search after reasons in the *Phaedo*. Socrates in the *Phaedo* has come to be unable to understand why a thing gets bigger. He could not be satisfied with the explanation that a thing becomes bigger by addition of some measure of length to the original bulk. This wandering search leads him to hold the theory of Forms. Prof. Fujisawa points out that the view of change in the puzzle is in accordance with the thinking which leads Socrates to the theory of Forms. At the same time Prof. Fujisawa points out that the thought about change in the puzzle contradicts the idea of an internal property in the *Phaedo*. The idea of an internal property leads to the thought that a thing has a certain property in itself. Prof. Fujisawa identifies this curious difficulty as arising from the act of describing the theory of Forms by the idiom of participation which contains an ontological commitment to the priority of an individual thing.

Prof. Fujisawa says that Plato became well aware of this difficulty at the time of writing the *Theaetetus*. Plato exposes the difficulty in the *Parmenides* and tries to grapple squarely with the problem in the *Theaetetus*. In the puzzle passage Plato reconfirms the view of change which led him to the theory of Forms, and in the analysis of sense-perception which follows this passage he tries to deny the idea that an individual thing ('this something') subsists in itself.

In this way Prof. Fujisawa puts the puzzle into the context of the development of Plato's philosophy as a whole and elucidates the philosophical significance of the puzzle and why the puzzle passage is placed where it is.

The problem of how to translate the phrase '*eme telikonde onta*', however, can be treated independently of the development of Plato's thought. It gives, at least to me, a somewhat strange impression that Prof. Fujisawa is compelled to put the problem into the context of the development of Plato's thought and criticizes the translation of Prof.

Tanaka, and that with a great deal of hesitation.

I guess something like the following happened. Prof. Fujisawa criticized Prof. Tanaka's translation in the note because he prides himself on his achievement in the study of Plato's philosophy which is of different sort or level from that of Prof. Tanaka's and expresses his gratitude for Prof. Tanaka's teaching by disagreeing with him. I suppose that this criticism is due to the thinking that going beyond one's master is the only way to requite his favors.

This essay is concerned with the prospect of elucidating Plato's later thought after the *Theaetetus* and the task of philosophy itself. Prof. Fujisawa has passed away without completing this work. We are left behind without having requited his favors, and grieve about our misfortune of being left behind. But we are aware that what we can do to requite his favors is to follow the master and to develop our own study. Prof. Fujisawa has shown the way which we should follow by his writings and his life as a philosopher.